



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,452	07/27/2001	Zhigang Liu	NC17236 (NOKI02-17236)	8743
30973	7590	05/03/2005		EXAMINER
SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P. 5956 SHERRY LANE SUITE 1400 DALLAS, TX 75225			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/916,452	LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner Hassan Phillips	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendments and remarks filed on March 14, 2005.

Drawings

2. After consideration of the corrected drawing sheets for Figures 2-4, the Examiner has withdrawn all objections to the drawings.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed March 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that: none of the prior art references cited by the Examiner appear to disclose implicit synchronicity of selection, or of implicit deletion, of dictionary content in a synchronous manner relating to a sending-receiving entity pair. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In regards to Applicants arguments, the Examiner feels implicit synchronicity of selection, or of implicit deletion, of dictionary content in a synchronous manner relating to a sending-receiving entity pair is taught by Benayoun. The teachings of Benayoun disclose a transmit device and a receive device that have transmit and receive dictionaries, (col. 2, lines 42-52). Benayoun further teaches both the transmit and receive dictionaries being updated each time a new string of characters has to be transmitted so that the contents of the dictionaries remain identical, (col. 2, lines 52-55). By indicating that the transmit and receive dictionaries are updated at a specific point in

time (i.e. each time a new string of characters has to be transmitted) in order for the dictionaries to remain identical, the Examiner believes the teachings of Benayoun clearly disclose implicit synchronicity of selection and implicit deletion of dictionary content in a synchronous manner relating to a sending-receiving entity pair.

Furthermore, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 7-14, 16-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Benayoun et al. (hereinafter Benayoun), U.S. Patent 6,415,061.

6. In considering claims 1 and 16, Benayoun teaches an apparatus and a method for a first communication station operable in a communication system comprising a sending-receiving entity pair that utilizes a selected signaling protocol to effectuate signaling of a first communication station; said apparatus and method for selectively facilitating deletion of dictionary content stored at a first-station dictionary device associated with the first communication station, the first-station dictionary utilized pursuant to effectuation of the signaling, the apparatus and method comprising: A first dictionary content deletion selector coupled to the first-station dictionary device, said first dictionary content deletion selector for selecting which, if any, portion of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device is to be deleted, selection made by said first dictionary content deletion selector responsive at least to an indication of additional dictionary content to be added to the first-station dictionary device, selection made by said first dictionary content deletion selector made in implicit synchronicity to delete corresponding portions, in amount and location, pursuant to synchronous operation of the sending-receiving entity pair, (col. 2, lines 38-67).

7. In considering claim 7, Benayoun teaches the first-station dictionary device comprising a FIFO (first-in, first-out)-structured memory device and wherein the dictionary content, if any, selected by said first dictionary content deletion selector to be deleted comprises first-in dictionary content, (col. 3, lines 42-51).

8. In considering claim 8, Benayoun teaches the first-in dictionary content selected to be deleted in amounts corresponding to amounts for the additional dictionary content indicated to be added to the first-station dictionary device, (col. 6, lines 18-50).

9. In considering claim 9, Benayoun teaches the first-station dictionary device being embodied at an entity having both a compressor for compressing an outgoing protocol signal originated at the first communication station and a decompressor for decompressing an incoming message originated at the second communication station, wherein the first-station dictionary device is coupled to both the compressor and the decompressor, and wherein the indication of the additional dictionary content responsive to which said first dictionary content deletion selector makes the selection, includes additional dictionary content associated with either incoming and outgoing messages, (col. 1, lines 34-41, and col. 2, lines 38-67).

10. In considering claim 10, Benayoun teaches the first-station dictionary device being embodied at an entity having a compressor for compressing an outgoing protocol

signal originated at the first communication station, wherein the first-station dictionary device includes a first portion coupled to the compressor, and wherein the indication of the additional dictionary content responsive to which the said first dictionary content deletion selector makes the selection includes additional dictionary content associated with the outgoing protocol signal, (col. 2, lines 38-67).

11. In considering claim 11, Benayoun teaches the sending-receiving entity pair comprising a second communication station with which the first communication effectuates the signaling and wherein the entity at which the first-station dictionary device is embodied further having a decompressor for decompressing an incoming protocol signal originated at a second communication station, wherein the first-station dictionary device further includes a second portion coupled to the decompressor, and wherein the indication of the additional dictionary content responsive to which said first dictionary content deletion selector makes the selection includes additional dictionary content associated with the incoming protocol signal, (col. 1, lines 34-41, and col. 2, lines 38-67).

12. In considering claims 12 and 18, the teachings of Benayoun provide a means for a second dictionary content deletion selector coupled to a second-station dictionary device, said second dictionary content deletion selector for selecting which, if any, portion of the dictionary content stored at the second-station dictionary device is to be deleted, selection made by said second dictionary content deletion selector responsive

Art Unit: 2151

at least to an indication of additional dictionary content to be added to the second station dictionary device, (col. 2, lines 38-67).

13. In considering claims 13 and 19, Benayoun teaches a method for updating dictionaries in a data transmission system comprising: a first dictionary content deletion selector and a second content deletion selector synchronously operable during a communication session during which a signaling protocol is effectuated between a first communication station and a second communication station, (col. 2, lines 42-67).

14. In considering claims 14 and 20, Benayoun teaches the first dictionary content deletion selector and said second dictionary content deletion selector being operable during the communication session, free of explicit signaling there between separate from the signaling protocol, (col. 2, lines 42-67).

15. In considering claim 17, Benayoun further teaches deleting the portion of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device selected during the operation of selecting, (col. 2, lines 42-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2151

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 2-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benayoun in view of Yabe, U.S. Patent 6,490,669.

18. In considering claim 2, although the system of Benayoun shows substantial features of the claimed invention, if fails to expressly show indicating the size of additional content to be added to the dictionary device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Yabe teaches a system for compressing data comprising: an indication of the indicia size of additional content to be added to a dictionary device 2. See col. 5, lines 8-29.

Thus, given the teachings of Yabe it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Benayoun in order to have an indication of indicia size of additional dictionary content to be added to the first-station dictionary device. This would have provided an efficient means for expanding bandwidth and thereby improving signaling between communication systems, Yabe col. 3, lines 7-45.

19. In considering claim 3, the teachings of Benayoun provide a means for the indicia to be defined in terms of byte size, (col. 2, lines 11-21).

20. In considering claim 4, the teachings of Benayoun provide a means for the indicia to be defined in terms of byte size, and the selection to be made by the first dictionary content deletion selector responsive to an indication of the byte sizes of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device, (col. 2, lines 11-21).

21. In considering claim 5, Benayoun teaches the first-station dictionary device comprising a memory element at which the dictionary content is stored, wherein the memory element exhibits a memory capacity definable in terms of bytes, and wherein the indication of the byte sizes of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device is representative of the memory capacity of the memory element less the byte sizes of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device, (col. 3, line 24, through col. 4, line 45).

22. In considering claim 6, the teachings of Benayoun provide a means for the first dictionary content deletion selector to further determine, responsive to the indication of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device and to the indication of the additional dictionary content to be added to the first-station dictionary device whether memory capacity is available at the memory element of the first-station dictionary device and, responsive thereto, for selecting which, if any, portion of the dictionary content stored at the first-station dictionary device is to be deleted, (col. 3, line 24, through col. 4, line 45).

23. Claim 15, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benayoun in view of Schmid et al. (hereinafter Schmid) U.S. Patent 6,735,291.

24. In considering claim 15, although the system of Benayoun shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to teach sequence numbers being provided for the additional dictionary content.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Schmid teaches a system and method utilizing telephony resources comprising: utilizing a selected signaling protocol to effectuate signaling between a first communication station and a second communication station wherein a first signaling protocol message, and at least a second signaling protocol message originated at the second communication station and sent to the first communications station, are identified by sequence numbers. See col. 6, lines 28-41.

Furthermore, utilizing sequence numbers in messages were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Thus, given the teachings of Schmid it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Benayoun to have messages identified by sequence numbers, and the selection made by the first dictionary content deletion selector being responsive to the sequence number of the additional dictionary content. This would have provided an efficient and error-proof means for accurately deleting the appropriate content from the dictionaries at the first and second communication stations, Schmid col. 6, lines 33-36.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
4/29/05



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER